



R_5 and R_6 are each, individually, hydroxy, alkoxy having from 1 to 18 carbons, hydroxy-substituted alkoxy having from 1 to 18 carbons, amino or alkylamido having from 1 to 18 carbons;

the phosphate group mono and diesters of the compounds thereof with monohydric and polyhydric alcohols having from 1 to 18 carbons, or alkylamino alcohols, each having from 1 to 18 carbons, and the salts thereof.

Claim 2, line 1, cancel "chelating compound" and substitute therefor, --- chelate ---.

Claim 3, line 1, cancel "chelating compound" and substitute therefor, --- chelate ---.

Claim 4, line 1, cancel "chelating compound" and substitute therefor, --- chelate ---.

Claim 5, line 1, cancel "chelating compound" and substitute therefor, --- chelate ---.

Claim 6, line 1, cancel "chelating compound" and substitute therefor, --- chelate ---.

Claim 7, line 1, cancel "chelating compound" and substitute therefor, --- chelate ---.

Claim 8, line 1, cancel "chelating compound" and substitute therefor, --- chelate ---.

Claim 10, line 1, after "Claim", cancel "9" and substitute therefor, --- 1 ---.

Claim 11, line 1, after "Claim", cancel "9" and substitute therefor, --- 1 ---.

REMARKS

The drawings have been replaced with formal drawings which are believed to be a substantial duplicate of the informal drawings originally submitted,

with the change that they now conform to the formal drawings requirements of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

Claim 9 has been cancelled, and Claim 1 has been amended to represent the equivalent of Claim 9, depending from Claim 1, rewritten in independent form. The preamble of Claims 2-8, depending from Claim 1, have been amended to replace the term "chelating agent" with "chelate" which has an antecedent in amended Claim 1. Claims 10 and 11 have been amended to have them depend from amended Claim 1. These amendments present original Claims 9-11 in a form which does not depend from claims of a non-elected invention.

Claims 1-8 have been amended to correspond to original Claim 9. Claims 20-54 have been cancelled. No claims to a non-elected invention remain in the application.

Complete basis for the amended claims are provided by the original claims 1-19. No new matter is introduced by these amendments.

The restriction requirement is unclear in one respect. The claims of Group I are listed as Claims 1-8, 20 and 21. The omission of Claims 22-31 from the formal description of this group appears to be either an oversight or a typographical error, since these claims were not listed as members of any other group; Claims 22-25 depend from Claim 21; and the structure of the compounds of Claims 26-31 differ from the compounds of Claims 20-25 only in the presence of hydrogen atoms in the amine structure. Based on the above, the claims of Group I are considered to be Claims 1-8 and 20-31.

Confirmation or clarification is requested.

Divisional applications will be filed directed to the non-elected inventions of Group I (corresponding to original Claims 1-8 and 20-31); Group III (corresponding to original Claims 32-43) and Group IV (corresponding to original Claims 44-54). The claims remaining in this application correspond to the elected invention of original Claims 9-19.

The rejection of Claims 9-19 under 35 USC 101 and 112 is submitted to be improper. The positive structures on pages 9 and 10 are not speculation. They represent the correct structures, as determined by laboratory structure analysis of the subject of this invention.

The rejection is unclear in that it appears to require a proof of structure in the record (actual reduction to practice) as a requirement of 35 USC 101 and 112. The statutes and their interpretations favor an early disclosure and accept a constructive reduction to practice, established law which appears to be inconsistent with the position of the Examiner. If the Examiner repeats his questions about the accuracy of the structures presented, he is requested to provide an explanation and a documented basis therefor in conformance with the requirements of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure.

The rejection of Claims 9 and 14 under 35 USC 112, fourth paragraph, as being of improper dependent form is submitted to be moot in view of the above amendments. The claims are no longer dependent from claims drawn to a non-elected invention.

As shown above, correct formal drawings have been submitted, and the claims have been amended to conform to the requirements of 35 USC 112. Conformance of the Claims and Specification to 35 USC 101 has also been shown.

Therefore, a reconsideration and early allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



William B. Walker
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 22,498
(408) 249-7750

Date: June 23, 1989

William B. Walker P.C.
2021 The Alameda, Suite 101
San Jose, CA 95126